APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/364,370	07/30/1999	TOM THUAN CHEUNG	ST9-99-077/P70-42971	9357

27896　　7590　　01/14/2003

EPSTEIN, EDELL, SHAPIRO, FINNAN & LYTLE, LLC
1901 RESEARCH BOULEVARD
SUITE 400
ROCKVILLE, MD 20850

EXAMINER
HO, THE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication app ars on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

P riod for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _04 November 2002_ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 11/04/2002.

2. Claims 1-30 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8, 11-18 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Dean U.S Patent No. 6,003,094 in view of Smithies U.S Patent No.

5,544,255.

As to claim 11, Dean discloses a computer (gateway workstation 14, line 36

column 2); computer programs (1-5, Fig. 2), performed by the computer, for receiving

(6, Fig. 3) an input object (client-side request object, lines 1-2 column 4) contains input

data (data indicative of requests of a given request type, line 48-49 column 2) and one

input function (request data, line 50 column 2; and Myflight.encodefixedformat and

Myflight.writemessage, Fig. 3) executable on a computer (gateway workstation 14, line

36 column 2), determining a type of the received input object (to ascertain what type of

request it has received, lines 31-32 column 4), executing the input function (execute the

request, line 55 column 4) on a computer (gateway workstation 14, line 36 column 2).

However, Dean does not teach determining if the input object satisfies predefined requirement.

Smithies teaches determining (to verify, line 47 column 7) if the input object (signature envelope 10, line 48 column 7) satisfies (lines 47-54 column 7) predefined requirement (a signatory database, line 51 column 7). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Smithies to the system of Dean because it provides security when processing a client object as disclosed by Smithies (lines 7-32 column 4).

As to claim 12, Smithies further teaches ascertaining whether the received input object satisfies predefined requirements by executing (are performed, line 36 column 7) verification functions (verification functions, line 36 column 7).

As to claim 13, Smithies further teaches a source code for each verification function (verification functions, line 36 column 7) is located in a predefined section of a controller object (signature verification module 6, line 8 column 16) source code.

As to claim 14, Dean as modified further teaches computer programs (lines 60 column 3 to line 32 column 5) executing on the computer for producing (creates, line 57 column 4) an output object (a relevant reply message, line 57 column 4) by using a result produced by the executed input function (once the request has been executed, line 56 column 4).

As to claim 15, Dean as modified further teaches the received input object is received from an application (front end booking software, line 29 column 2), computer programs (lines 60 column 3 to line 32 column 5) performed by the computer for

returning (sends, line 64 column 4) the output object (the message, line 64 column 4) to

the application.

As to claim 16, Dean as modified further teaches the received input object is

received from a user (a client, line 28 column 2), computer programs (lines 60 column 3

to line 32 column 5) performed by the computer for returning the output object (12 and

13, Fig. 3) to the user.

As to claim 17, Dean as modified further teaches receiving (handles, line 11

column 2) a plurality of input objects (requests, line 11 column 2), wherein each

received input object contains an input function (request data, line 50 column 2), and

wherein each input function has a predefined signature (ticket booking, line 28 column

2).

As to claim 18, Dean as modified further teaches computer programs (lines 60

column 3 to line 32 column 5) performed by to a computer for regulating a flow (5 and 6,

Fig. 3, and lines 14-29 column 4) of received input objects.

As to the method of claim 1, note the discussion of the apparatus of claim 11

above.

As to claims 2-8, note the discussions of claims 12-18 above, respectively.

As to the computer program of claim 21, note the discussion of the apparatus of

claim 11 above.

As to claims 22-28, note the discussions of claims 12-18 above, respectively.

4. Claims 9, 19 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean in view of Smithies, and further in view of Aditham U.S Patent No. 6,378,001.

As to claim 19, Dean as modified does not disclose a queue. Aditham teaches storing received objects in a queue (FIFO queue stores message objects, lines 19-20 column 6). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Aditham to the system of Dean because it is necessary to store the objects in an ordered structure while waiting to be processed as disclosed by Aditham (lines 17-33 column 6).

As to claims 9 and 29, note the discussion of claim 19 above.

5. Claims 10, 20 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean in view of Smithies, and further in view of Nakai U.S Patent No. 6,253,248.

As to claim 20, note the discussions of claims 15 and 16 above. However, Dean as modified does not disclose a request to resend an object. Nakai teaches requesting the sender (requests the client 107, line 40 column 13) to re-send the received input objects (to resend the request, line 41 column 13) at a later time (1213, Fig. 14). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Nakai to the system of Dean because if the client's application needs to be updated, the client has to resend the quest to the server as disclosed by Nakai (lines 30-44 column 13).

As to claims 10 and 30, note the discussion of claim 20 above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 11/04/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Dean reference does not disclose an input function (Remarks, lines 12-13 page 5). In response, as disclosed in the claim rejection above, Dean teaches a computer (gateway workstation 14, line 36 column 2) receives (6, Fig. 3) an input object (client-side request object, lines 1-2 column 4) from the client workstation (10, Fig. 1) running on a Java platform (Java enabled browser, lines 29-30 column 2). Dean further discloses the object includes methods (Myflight.encodefixedformat and Myflight.writemessage, Fig. 3). In object-oriented programming, a method is the same as a function. Dean's input object therefore includes an input function. Dean reference meets the limitations as broadly claimed.

Applicant argued that Smithies reference does not disclose an input function (Remarks, lines 18-19 page 5). In response, Smithies reference is not used to disclose an input function. It is used to teach the limitation "determining if the received object satisfies predefined requirement" as disclosed in the claim rejection above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to The T. Ho whose telephone number is 703-306-5540.

A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be

reached on Monday – Thursday, 8:30 am – 6:00 pm, and every other Friday from 8:30

am – 5:00 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C 20231

Or fax to:

o   AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7238

o   OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7239

e   NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (703) 746 – 7240

t.h
January 7, 2003

ALVIN OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100